



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,773	08/02/2004	Charles Dana Shipes	SHI-01	4772
23508 7590 08/15/2007 LUNDEEN & DICKINSON, LLP PO BOX 131144 HOUSTON, TX 77219-1144			EXAMINER DONNELLY, JEROME W	
			ART UNIT 3764	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No. #

10/710,773

Applicant(s)

SHIPES, CHARLES DANA

Examiner

Jerome W. Donnelly

Art Unit

3764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected. 1-8 and 10-14
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) **JEROME DONNELLY**
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ **PRIMARY EXAMINER**
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 3764

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stephens.

Stephens discloses a device comprising a shaft (36) which extends upwards as well as downward from a support base, a bearing locator 124, a transverse member 3, 32 and a training target suspended from the transverse members and an electric motor for rotating the vertical member.

In regard to claim 2 note the flat support base of Fig. 1 element (48).

In regard to claim 7, Stephens discloses a device wherein his frame member/transverse member includes truss members (note labeled).

In regard to claim 8, note fig. 1.

In regard to claim 10, note the abstract.

In regard to claim 11, note the abstract.

In regard to claim 12 and 13 note fig. 1.

In regard to claim 14, note fig. 1.

In regard to claim 15, note col. 6, lines 51 and 52.

In regard to claims 16-18, the method is fully disclosed in the combination of the abstract and the disclosure of fig. 1.

In regard to claim 6 and as broadly claimed side brace members, (not label) positioned a vertical leg members (not labeled) may be considered as outwardly extending leg members.

Art Unit: 3764

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholson.

Nicholson discloses a device comprising a base having a plate a rotatable shaft (24) bearings which inherently must have locators, a bearing (22), a transverse member (44) a target (42) and an electric motor.

Nicholson however does not disclose his base plate as being circular, rectangular or polygonal.

The examiner however notes that to manufacture the base and base plate of Nicholson of any of the claimed shapes of the device of claims 2-5 would have been arbitrary obvious shapes known for base members unless the applicant can provide the claimed criticality of the shapes of the claimed devices.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 10-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3764

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerome Donnelly at telephone number (571) 272-4975.

Jerome Donnelly